

### **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendment and reconsideration of the claims. Claims 7, 12, 13, 15-17, 19, and 20 are pending in this application. *No new matter has been added.* Applicants reserve the right to prosecute the same or similar claims in the present or future applications.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 7, 12, 13, 15-17, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haberlander et al. (US 6457944) in view of Moddemann (US 2002/0067148), Attwater et al. (US 5,482,448), and Jacobs et al. (US 2003/0104634). This rejection is traversed.

In particular, none of the cited references disclose or suggest a method including the step of “increasing a quantity of metered medium delivered per unit of time just before the end of the compression stroke by increasing the rotational speed of the motor just before the end of the compression stroke.” Contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, Jacobs fails to disclose or suggest this step.

Jacobs discloses that to avoid having variable residual fluid in the dispensing nozzle it is desirable to avoid gradual lowering of the dispensing flow rate to zero. See Jacobs at paragraph 007; and FIG. 5. It teaches a method wherein the fluid dispensing is stopped abruptly before the velocity would otherwise gradually drop to zero. See Jacobs at paragraphs 0073-76; and FIGS. 6, 7. Jacobs teaches a method where the flow rate at the end of the stroke is higher as compared to the end flow rate in the referenced prior art systems. However, in Jacobs the flow rate at the end of the stroke is still decreasing rather than increased as claimed. Accordingly, even if all the cited references were combinable, the combination would not include all of the claimed features. Therefore, claim 13 is not obvious. Claims 7 and 12 depend on and further describe the features of claim 13, therefore, they are not obvious for at least the same reasons.

Claim 15 is directed to a method that includes the step of increasing the quality of metered media delivered per unit time at the end of the compression stroke. As discussed above, none of the cited references disclose or suggest increasing the flow rate at the end of the compression stroke. Accordingly, claim 15 is also not obvious. Claims 16, 17, 19, and 20

depend on and further describe claim 1, therefore, they are not obvious for at least the same reasons.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Please consider this a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME for a sufficient number of months to enter these papers or any future reply, if appropriate. Please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: April 25, 2011

/Anneliese S. Mayer/  
Anneliese S. Mayer  
Reg. No. 54,434  
ASM/JEL:sl

**92160**

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE